



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/651,076

08/28/2003

Michael Grannan

1033-SS00415

7264

84326

7590

03/23/2010

AT & T LEGAL DEPARTMENT - Toler

ATTN: PATENT DOCKETING

ROOM 2A-207

ONE AT & T WAY

BEDMINISTER, NJ 07921

EXAMINER

GREGG, MARY M

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3694

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

03/23/2010

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/651,076	Applicant(s) GRANNAN ET AL.	
	Examiner MARY GREGG	Art Unit 3694	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 February 2010.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10, 16-18, 22-24, 50, 51 and 53-62 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10, 16-18, 22-24, 50, 51 and 53-62 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>12/15/2009</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. The following is a Non-Final Office Action in response to communications received February 19, 2010. Claim 11-15 and 29-41 has been withdrawn. Claims 19-21, 25-28, 42-49 and 52 have been canceled. Claims 1-10, 16-18, 23, 50-51, 53-56 and 58-62 have been amended. No new claims have been added. Therefore, claims 1-10, 16-18, 22-24, 50-51 and 53-62 are pending and addressed below.

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

2. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17 (e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission has been entered.

Response to Amendments/Arguments

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. Applicant's amendments in response to the rejections set forth in the previous Office Action are sufficient to overcome the rejections for failing to comply with the written description requirement. The examiner withdraws the rejections.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. Applicant's arguments with respect to claim 1-10, 16-18, 22-24, 50-51 and 53-62 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Art Unit: 3694

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

7. Claims 1-7 and 53-56 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent No. 6,362,863 B1 by Shaw et al. (Shaw), and further in view of US Patent No. 7,213,005 B2 by Muraud et al (Mau).

In reference to Claim 1:

Shaw teaches:

(Currently Amended) A content broker system comprising: memory to store a device profile table accessible by a content broker module ((Shaw) in at least FIG. 1, FIG. 2; Col 4 lines 10-25, 45-50, Col 6 lines 50-55), the device profile table including information identifying at least one media device associated with a user account and a list of two or more media formats that **can** be utilized by the at least one media device

Art Unit: 3694

((Shaw) in at least FIG. 2, FIG. 4; Col 3 lines 50-63, Col 4 lines 15-25, 45-50, Col 5 lines 5-20, 55-67, Col 9 lines 1-9, 30-54, Col 10 lines 1-10); and a content broker process server including the content broker module ((Shaw) in at least abstract; FIG. 1, FIG. 2, FIG. 7B; Col 4 lines 5-40, Col 6 lines 1-10, Col 9 lines 15-25, 55-67); the content broker module to: send to a content provider that is distinct from the content broker system and the at least one media device, the list of two or more media formats that **can** be utilized by the at least one media device wherein the list is retrieved from the memory ((Shaw) in at least Col 9 lines 15-25, 30-54, Col 12 lines 20-40); and receive media content in a particular media format from the content provider, wherein the particular media format is selected by the content provider from the two or more media formats ((Shaw) in at least col 12 lines 19-50);...

Shaw suggest:

... and receive a digital rights license key from the content provider, the new digital rights license key enabling use of the media content .((Shaw) in at least Col 8 lines 55-65, Col 9 lines 5-14, 30-35).

Mau teaches:

... and receive a digital rights license key from the content provider, the new digital rights license key enabling use of the media content ((Mau) Col 10 lines 19-20, 23-28) in response to a subscriber request, the new digital rights license key to authorize the set of new usage rights)

Although the prior art Shaw does not explicitly teach receiving a digital rights license key, the prior art does teach the broker authenticates use of application against

Art Unit: 3694

database information, and teaches a list of applications that can be presented to the user for application access. Mau teaches the motivation of license keys with respect to application usage so as to provide authorized content to users. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the prior art teachings as there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation in the prior art that would have led one of ordinary skill to modify the prior art reference or to combine prior art reference teachings to arrive at the claimed invention. See MPEP § 214 3.

Note: Claim limitations that contain statement(s) such as "if, may, might, can could", as optional language. As matter of linguistic precision, optional claim elements do not narrow claim limitations, since they can always be omitted. Claim limitations that contain statement(s) such as "wherein, whereby", that fail to further define the steps or acts to be performed in method claims or the discrete physical structure required of system claims.

USPTO personnel should begin claim analysis by identifying and evaluating each claim limitation. For processes, the claim limitations will define steps or acts to be performed. For products, the claim limitations will define discrete physical structures or materials. Product claims are claims that are directed to either machines, manufactures or compositions of matter. See MPEP § 2106 II C.

The subject matter of a properly construed claim is defined by the terms that limit its scope. It is this subject matter that must be examined. As a general matter, the grammar and intended meaning of terms used in a claim will dictate whether the language limits the claim scope. Language that suggests or makes optional but does not require steps to be performed or does not limit a claim to a particular structure does not limit the scope of a claim or claim limitation. The following are examples of language that may raise a question as to the limiting effect of the language in a claim:

Art Unit: 3694

(A) statements of intended use or field of use,

(B) "adapted to" or "adapted for" clauses,

(C) "wherein" clauses, or

(D) "whereby" clauses.

See MPEP § 2106 II C

In reference to Claim 2:

The combination teaches:

(Currently Amended) The content broker system of claim 1 (see rejection of claim 1 above), wherein memory further includes a media asset table that includes data associated with the media content acquired for the user account from a plurality of content providers, the data including, for each media content item, a unique identifier, a title, a category, a media type, a media characteristic, usage rights, a license key, a purchase date, a distributor purchase ID, a distributor unique content ID, and a distributor identifier ((Shaw) in at least abstract; FIG. 7B; Col 9, Col 8 lines 55-67. Col 11 lines 17-33. Col 14 lines 50-65; (Mau) Col 61 lines 20-22, FIG. 14, FIG. 23-24, FIG. 30-38)

In reference to Claim 3:

The combination teaches:

(Currently Amended) The content broker system of claim [[1]] 2 (see rejection of claim 2 above), further comprising a single sign-on identity service to authorize access to the user account based on received single sign-on authentication credentials, and to authorize access to the plurality of content providers based on the received single sign-

Art Unit: 3694

on authentication credential ((Shaw) in at least col 4 lines 35-45, Col 8 lines 60-67, Col 9 lines 5-15, 30-35, Col 13 lines 40-60).

In reference to Claim 4:

The combination teaches:

(Currently Amended) The content broker system of claim [[1]] 3, wherein authorizing access to the plurality of content providers includes: aggregating media content titles of media content available from the plurality of content providers ((Shaw) in at least FIG. 1, FIG. 7B; Col 9 lines 3-55), receiving subscriber request to access the media content; and sending an access request to the content provider along with the list of two or more media formats that can be utilized by the at least one media device.((Shaw) in at least FIG. 7A-B; Col 5 lines 5-Col 6 lines 1-10)

In reference to Claim 5:

The combination teaches:

(Currently Amended) The content broker system of claim 1 (see rejection of claim 1 above), further comprising a network interface that uses web services protocols to communicate with the content provider ((Shaw) in at least FIG. 2, FIG. 4; Col 1 lines 45-55, Col 4 lines 15-20, 45-60; (Mau) FIG. 6; Col 25 lines 60-61).

In reference to Claim 6:

The combination teaches:

(Currently Amended) The content broker system of claim [[1]] 3, wherein the content provider uses the single sign-on authentication credentials to verify a user's subscription to a hosting service and to initiate requests to obtain device profile

Art Unit: 3694

information including the list of two or more media formats that can be utilized by the at least one media device ((Shaw) in at least Col 9 lines 15-25, 30-54, Col 12 lines 20-40).

In reference to Claim 7:

The combination teaches:

(Currently Amended) The content broker system of claim 6 (see rejection of claim 6 above), wherein the content broker module receives media content information, the media content, and the digital rights license key in response to a content purchase request by the user ((Shaw) Col 4 lines 32-40, Col 8 lines 60-67, Col 9 lines 1-15, 30-35, Col 11 lines 17-35, Col 13 lines 22-50; (Mau) FIG. 6, FIG. 8-9, FIG. 10, FIG. 12; Col 43 lines 14-45, Col 44 lines 62-64, Col 45 lines 49-52, Col 46 lines 18-20, 46-49, 62-63, 65-68)

In reference to Claim 53:

The combination teaches:

(Currently Amended) The content broker system of claim 23 (see rejection of claim 23 above), wherein the memory stores a media asset table associated with the user account, wherein the media asset table indicates usage rights associated with media assets, the usage rights including a right to store the received media content on at least one media device ((Shaw) in at least FIG. 2, FIG. 4; Col 3 lines 50-63, Col 4 lines 15-25, 45-50, Col 5 lines 5-20, 55-67, Col 9 lines 1-9, 30-54, Col 10 lines 1-10; (Mau) Col 10 line 67, Col 11 lines 1-3, Col 14 lines 6-25).

In reference to Claim 54:

The combination teaches:

Art Unit: 3694

(Currently Amended) The content broker system of claim 1 (see rejection of claim 1 above), wherein the memory stores a media asset table associated with the user account, wherein the media asset table indicates usage rights associated with media assets, the usage right including a right to store received media content in the particular media format ((Shaw) in at least Col 8 lines 55-65, Col 9 lines 5-14, 30-35; (Mau) Col 10 line 67, Col 11 lines 1-3, Col 14 lines 6- 25)

(see rationale supporting obviousness and motivation to combine of claim 1 above)

In reference to Claim 55:

The combination teaches:

(Currently amended) The content broker system of claim 1 (see rejection of claim 1 above), wherein the memory is further to store a log of media assets that are associated with the user account ((Shaw) in at least FIG. 1, FIG. 2; Col 4 lines 10-25, 45-50, Col 6 lines 50-55, Col 3 lines 50-63, Col 5 lines 5-20, 55-67, Col 9 lines 1-9, 30-54, Col 10 lines 1-10 ;(Mau) Col 14 lines 6-10).

(see rationale supporting obviousness and motivation to combine of claim 1 above)

In reference to Claim 56:

The combination teaches:

(Currently Amended) The content broker system of claim 1 (see rejection of claim 1 above), wherein in response to a user request to reacquire a previously accessed media asset, the content broker module is further to provide to the third party content provider a license key obtained when the previously accessed media asset was purchased ((Mau) Col 14 lines 12-14, Col 10 lines 19-20, 23-28)

Art Unit: 3694

(see rationale supporting obviousness and motivation to combine of claim 1 above)

8. Claims 8 and 59-60 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent No. 7,203,966 B2 by Abburi et al. (Abb)

In reference to Claim 8:

The combination teaches:

(Currently Amended) A method of distributing content, the method comprising: electronically sending, by a processor, a usage rights request requesting usage rights for a media asset ((Abb) Col 15 lines 22-23, Col 16 lines 6-12), wherein the new usage rights validate permission to play the previously accessed media asset at a second subscriber media device((Abb) in at least FIG. 25, Col 4 lines 18-50, Col 58 lines 35-45); sending device profile information regarding the subscriber media device, wherein the device profile information specifies two or more media formats that are compatible with the subscriber media device ((Abb) in at least FIG. 2; Col 10 lines 1-60, Col 68 lines 50-60, Col 69 lines 1-25); receiving the media asset in a media format compatible with the subscriber media device from content provider, wherein the media format is selected by the content provider based on the device profile information ((Abb) in at least Col 10 lines 30-40; wherein the prior art teaches explicitly two different formats, Col 36 lines 11-30); and receiving from [[a]] the content provider media characteristics including the media format and fidelity, of the received media asset and a digital rights license key, the digital rights license key to authorize the requested usage rights ((Abb) Col 3 lines 60-67, Col 4 lines 1-10, 16-28).

Art Unit: 3694

Although the prior art does not explicitly teach “profiles teaches two or more formats” the prior art does explicitly teach “received in a compressed format such as the .wav or .mpe format” and teaches that user require media data for various devices and purchase media in different format (i.e audio, video) which would make obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the inventions the limitations of the claim, as there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation in the prior art that would have led one of ordinary skill to modify the prior art reference or to combine prior art reference teachings to arrive at the claimed invention. See MPEP § 214 3

In reference to Claim 59:

Ab teaches:

(Currently Amended) The method of claim 8 (see rejection of claim 8 above), wherein the requested new usage rights include a right to store a previously accessed media asset on a specified device ((Abb) col 4 lines 20-54, Col 58 lines 43-49)

In reference to Claim 60:

The combination teaches:

(currently amended) The method of claim 8 (see rejection of claim 8 above), wherein the requested usage rights include a right to store a previously accessed media asset in a specified format ((Abb) in at least Col 10 lines 30-42; (Parks) in at least Col 9 lines 55-65)

9. Claims 9 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent No. 7,203,966 B2 by Abburi et al. (Abb) as applied to claim 8 above, and further in view of US Patent No. 7,054,416 B2 by Meyerson et al. (Mey)

Art Unit: 3694

In reference to Claim 9:

Abb teaches:

(Currently Amended) The method of claim 8 (see rejection of claim 8 above),
wherein, in response to receiving the usage rights request and the device profile
information, ...resolution, fidelity, or bit rate to accommodate the usage right request.

Abb does not explicitly teach:

... the content provider adapts the media asset with regard to media format,...

Mey teaches:

... the content provider adapts the media asset with regard to media
format,...((Mey) abstract; Col 11 lines 31-59).

Both Abb and Mey are directed toward providing various media formats. Mey teaches the motivation of users rely on a combination of communication devices and require media content to be compatible with the various devices. Abb teaches explicitly that different devices require different formatting on disparate devices. The prior art therefore provides some teaching, suggestion, or motivation in the prior art that would have led one of ordinary skill to modify the prior art reference or to combine prior art reference teachings to arrive at the claimed invention. See MPEP § 214.3

10. Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent No. 7,203,066 B2 by Abburi et al. (Abb) as applied to claim 8 above, and further in view of US Patent No. 6,822,663 B2 by Wang et al. (Wang).

In reference to Claim 10:

Abb teaches:

Art Unit: 3694

(Currently Amended) The method of claim 8 (see rejection of claim 8 above), wherein a hosting service obtains the digital rights license key ... of the new digital rights license key ((Abb) Col 3 lines 60-67, Col 4 lines 1-10, 16-28).

Abb does not explicitly teach

...and notifies the content provider of receipt ...

Wang teaches:

...and notifies the content provider of receipt ((Wang) Col 10 lines 9-11, Col 14 lines 62-65; wherein in Col 10 Wang teaches when action is done verification notice is sent; wherein Col 14 Wang teaches template includes copyright and content areas in quick message)

The combination teaches explicitly of the new license and key being sent to the user. Wang teaches a message acknowledging copyrights and content areas after adaption is made. A license is permission to use content areas. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use a known technique to improve a similar method or product in the same way.

11. Claims 16-18, 22-24 and 62 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent No. 6,822,663 B2 by Wang et al. (Wang) and in view of US Patent No. 7,213,005 B2 by Maurad et al (Mau).

In reference to Claim 16:

Wang teaches:

(Currently Amended) A system to provide a content brokerage service, the system comprising: a content broker process server to: provide to a subscriber access

Art Unit: 3694

to the content brokerage service and access to a remote content provider using a set of single sign-on credentials ((Wang) in at least FIG. 1 ,FIG. 2; Col 2 lines 32-40, Col 5 lines 49-61, Col 6 lines 55-67, Col 7 lines 1-5); send a device profile associated with a subscriber media device of the subscriber to the remote content provider ((Wang) in at least FIG. 5-FIG. 8; Col 9 lines 30-39, 44-49); ...wherein the set of usage rights validates permission to play the media asset at a the subscriber media device; and a memory to store the device profile ((Wang) FIG. 1, Fig. 2, Fig. 5; Col 5 lines 60-65, Col 6 lines 45-46, Col 8 lines 50-60) ...

Wang suggest:

...and receive from the remote content provider a license key to authorize a set of usage rights associated with a media asset,...((Wang) Abstract; Col 2 lines 30-40)... wherein the device profile includes information identifying a plurality of media formats that are useable by the subscriber media device and memory information associated with the subscriber media device.((Wang) Col 5 lines 30-47, Col 8 lines 5-25, Col 11 lines 43-55, 60-67)

Mau teaches:

...and receive from the remote content provider a license key to authorize a set of usage rights associated with a media asset,...((Mau) Col 12 lines 2-7, 25-35, Col 14 lines 7-25, Col 22 lines 20-30).

Both Wang and Mau are explicitly directed toward providing media content to authorized users. Mau teaches the motivation of licensing in order to authorize media use, which provides some teaching, suggestion, or motivation in the prior art that would

Art Unit: 3694

have led one of ordinary skill to modify the prior art reference or to combine prior art reference teachings to arrive at the claimed invention. See MPEP § 214.3.

In reference to Claim 17:

The combination teaches:

(Currently Amended) The system of claim 16 (see rejection of claim 16 above), wherein the content broker process server facilitates distribution of the license key and the media asset to the subscriber media device ((Wang) Col 14 lines 60-65).

Wang does not explicitly teach:

... distribution of the license key and the media asset to the subscriber media device

Mau teaches:

... distribution of the license key and the media asset to the subscriber media device,...((Mau) Col 12 lines 2-7, 25-35, Col 14 lines 7-25, Col 22 lines 20-30).
(see rationale supporting obviousness and motivation to combine of claim 16 above)

In reference to Claim 18:

The combination teaches:

(Currently Amended) The system of claim 17 (see rejection of claim 17 above), wherein the content broker...

The combination teaches:

...process server facilitates the distribution of the license key and the media asset by sending a request to the remote content provider, wherein the request instructs the

Art Unit: 3694

remote content provider to send the license key and the media asset to the subscriber media device

Mau teaches:

...process server facilitates the distribution of the license key and the media asset by sending a request to the remote content provider, wherein the request instructs the remote content provider to send the license key and the media asset to the subscriber media device ((Mau) Col 16 lines 19-26, Col 10 lines 19-20, 23-28, Col 12 lines 2-7, 25-35, Col 14 lines 7-25, Col 22 lines 20-30, Col 26 lines 10-20, Col 30 lines 35-60, Col 39 lines 57-67, Col 46 lines 65-67, col 47 lines 1-19, col 50 lines 11-28, Col 78 lines 40-60)

Both Wang and Mau are explicitly directed toward providing media content to authorized users. Mau teaches the motivation of licensing in order to authorize media use, which provides some teaching, suggestion, or motivation in the prior art that would have led one of ordinary skill to modify the prior art reference or to combine prior art reference teachings to arrive at the claimed invention. See MPEP § 214 3.

In reference to Claim 22:

The combination teaches:

(Previously Presented) The system of claim 16 (see rejection of claim 16 above), wherein the device profile information includes a memory address to identify a free memory block to store distributed content data ((Wang) FIG. 1, FIG. 2; Col 6 lines 47-56, Col 9 lines 66-67, Col 10 lines 2-10).

In reference to Claim 23:

The combination teaches:

Art Unit: 3694

(Currently Amended) The system of claim 16 (see rejection of claim 16 above), wherein the memory is further to store content asset information within a media asset table, the content asset information including an indicator specifying media format of one or more media assets authorized for use by the subscriber ((Wang) FIG. 1, FIG. 2, FIG. 5; FIG. 10, Col 10 lines 13-25, 50- 52, Col 5 lines 60-65, Col 6 lines 45-46, Col 8 lines 50-60).

In reference to Claim 24:

The combination teaches:

(Previously Presented) The system of claim 23 (see rejection of claim 23 above), wherein the content asset information stored in the media asset table further includes purchase data ((Wang) abstract, Col 2 lines 55-60, Col 6 lines 46-55).

In reference to Claim 62:

The combination teaches:

(currently amended) The system of claim 16 (see rejection of claim 16 above), wherein the set of usage rights comprises a right to store (copy) the media asset in a specified format of the plurality of media formats that are useable by the subscriber media device((Wang) abstract, Col 2 lines 55-60, Col 6 lines 46-55)

12. Claims 50 and 51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent No. 6,822,663 B2 by Wang et al. (Wang) and in view of US Patent No. 7,213,005 B2 by Maurad et al (Mau)as applied to claims 16 and 21 above with respect to claim 50; as applied to claim 16 above with respect to claim 51; and further in view of US Patent No. 7,203,066 B2 by Abburi et al. (Abb).

Art Unit: 3694

In reference to Claim 50:

The combination teaches:

(Currently Amended) The system of claim [[21]] (see rejection of claim 16 above),

The combination does not teach:

...wherein the device profile information further includes a subscriber media device identification of the media device.

Abb teaches:

...wherein the device profile information further includes a subscriber media device identification of the media device ((Abb) Col 68 lines 41-49)

Both the combination and Abb are explicitly directed toward accessing source material for computer device. The combination teaches explicitly of source material and devices needing to be compatible. Abb teaches device identifiers to coordinate with license to control source access within the criteria of the provider. The combination teaches limited accessibility to protect the rights of the source provider. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings the combination and Abb to further protect the content by coordinating the device and license with the source

In reference to Claim 51:

The combination teaches:

(Currently Amended) The system of claim 23 (see rejection of claim 23 above), wherein the content asset information further includes, for each of the one or more media assets, a media asset identity, a media asset title, and a media asset category.

Art Unit: 3694

13. Claims 57 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent No. 6,362,863 B1 by Shaw et al. (Shaw), and US Patent No. 7,213,005 B2 by Maurad et al (Mau) and as applied to claim 1 above, US Patent No. 6,822,663 B2 by Wang et al. (Wang)

In reference to Claim 57:

The combination teaches:

(Previously Presented) The content broker system of claim 1 (see rejection of claim 1 above), wherein the device profile table further includes...

The combination does not explicitly teach:

... device portability information

Wang teaches:

... device portability information ((Wang) Col 2 lines 30-40)

The combination teaches disparate formatting requires for specific devices and teaches keys available for the multiple devices. The combination teaches a metadata template the includes data fields required by end-user devices. Wang teaches that many devices do not have the capability of other devices ((Wang) Col 1 lines 39-41). Wang teaches a graphical layout to display a number of device types and then list of device names for the user to chose from ((Wang) Col 9 lines 30-35, 45-49). The combination teaches a database that is user accessible provided by the Content Provider to retrieve as much data as possible ((Mau) Col 61 lines 20-21), where the Content provider can tailor the template to identify the types data the Content provider can provide the end-user ((Mau) Col 61 lines 24-26). The combination teaches explicitly

Art Unit: 3694

that the user condition definitions in Col 62 lines 20- 51, which includes what kinds of media the user can use the copies on. Wang is teaches the motivation of optimizing the source content according to the capacities of the device and teaches a need for a system that allows translation across multiple computer devices for greater convenience. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to expand the combination teachings with the teachings of Wang in order to optimize the source content with the user devices.

14. Claim 58 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent No. 6,362,863 B1 by Shaw et al. (Shaw), and US Patent No. 7,213,005 B2 by Maurad et al (Mau) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of US Patent No. 7,203,066 B2 by Abburi et al. (Abb).

In reference to Claim 58:

The combination teaches:

(currently amended) The content broker system of claim 1 (see rejection of claim 1 above), wherein the device profile table further includes information related to whether a specified subscriber media device includes ((Shaw) in at least FIG. 2, FIG. 4; Col 3 lines 50-63, Col 4 lines 15-25, 45-50, Col 5 lines 5-20, 55-67, Col 9 lines 1-9, 30-54, Col 10 lines 1-10)

The combination does not explicitly teach:

... a removable memory

Abb teaches:

... a removable memory ((Abb) Col 7 lines 27-35)

Abb is explicitly teaches licenses synchronized for multiple user devices. As taught by the combination each separate user device not of the same type requires different media formats and teaches of a need for the media data to be formatted for specific device types. Additionally, Wang teaches the motivation to optimize the source content according to the capabilities of the selected device and the flexibility of utilizing content across multiple devices. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include in the teachings of Abb which teach using multiple diverse devices the teachings of Wang to optimized media formats for separate user devices.

15. Claims 61 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent No. 6,822,663 B2 by Wang et al. (Wang) and US Patent No. 7,213,005 B2 by Maurad et al (Mau) as applied to claim 16 above and further in view of US Patent No. 7,203,066 B2 by Abburi et al (Abb).

In reference to Claim 61:

The combination teaches:

(Currently amended) The system of claim 16 (see rejection of claim 16 above), wherein the set of usage rights...

The combination does not explicitly teach:

... comprises a right to store (copy) the media asset on a the subscriber media device ((Abb) Col 2 lines 55-64, Col 3 lines 1-10)

Both the combination and Abb are explicitly directed toward accessing source material for computer device. The combination teaches explicitly of source material and

Art Unit: 3694

devices needing to be compatible. Abb teaches device identifiers to coordinate with license to control source access within the criteria of the provider. The combination teaches limited accessibility to protect the rights of the source provider. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings the combination and Abb to further provide access to the source material.

Conclusion

16. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MARY GREGG whose telephone number is (571)270-5050. The examiner can normally be reached on 4/10.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James Trammell can be reached on 5712726712. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

17. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Application/Control Number: 10/651,076
Art Unit: 3694

Page 23

/M. G./
Examiner, Art Unit 3694

/James P Trammell/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3694